

## Remarks

### I. Status of the Application and Claims

At the time that the present Office Action was mailed, the claims pending in the application were claims 28-47. No claims have been added or cancelled herein.

### II. The Amendments

Claims 28 and 41 have been amended to recite a reaction time of “about 6 to 8 hours” rather than a reaction time of “8 hours or less.” These amendments were made in response to a suggestion of the Examiner appearing on page 3 of the Office Action.

Claim 46 was amended to refer to a “compound” rather than to a “C<sub>6</sub>-C<sub>18</sub> aromatic substituted amino acid” or a “C<sub>6</sub>-C<sub>18</sub> aromatic substituted amino alcohol.”

The amendments made herein do not add new matter to the application and their entry is therefore respectfully requested.

### III. Objections to the Specification

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the sections on page 4 of the specification which refer to specific claims. The Examiner points out that, when claims are renumbered prior to issuance, these sections of the application may no longer be correct.

In response, Applicants have deleted the paragraph on page 4 of the specification that recites specific claim numbers. Applicants believe that this should have the effect of obviating the Examiner’s objection.

## The Rejections

### I. Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC §112, First Paragraph

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims are rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph based upon the allegation that the phrase “8 hours or less” goes beyond that which is disclosed in the application. The Examiner suggests using the phrase “about 6 to 8 hours” instead.

In response, Applicants have amended claims to incorporate the language suggested by the Examiner. In light of these amendments, Applicants believe that the present rejection has been overcome.

## **II. Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph**

On pages 3-4 of the Office Action, claim 46 is rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. The Examiner indicates that the phrases “C<sub>6</sub>-C<sub>18</sub> aromatic substituted amino acid” and “C<sub>6</sub>-C<sub>18</sub> aromatic substituted amino alcohol” lack antecedent basis.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 46 to replace the terms objected to with the term “compound.” Applicants believe that this should be sufficient to overcome the present rejection.

## **Conclusion**

In light of the considerations above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the present rejections of claims have been overcome. It is therefore respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a phone call may help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants’ undersigned attorney at (240)683-6165.

Respectfully submitted,  
LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL A. SANZO, LLC

By: /Michael A. Sanzo/  
Michael A. Sanzo  
Reg. No. 36,912  
Attorney for Applicants

Date: April 24, 2010  
15400 Calhoun Drive, Suite 125  
Rockville, Md. 20855  
(240)683-6165